

REMARKS

Following the Decision of the Board of Appeals dated December 11, 2008, claims 1-5, 9-16, 20-22, 25, 26, 29-32 and 34-35 remain rejected under 35 § U.S.C. 102(b) over Hobbs (US Patent No. 5,197,138), and claims 6-8, 17-19, 27-28, 33 and 36 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Hobbs in view of Radhakrishna (U.S. Patent No. 6,823,414).

In response to the Decision, Applicant files a Request for Continued Examination, along with this Amendment.

Amended independent claim 1 recites “processing a requested interrupt only when the interrupt priority value of the requested interrupt is higher than the global interrupt threshold value.” As disclosed in the specification at paragraph 0027 of the published application, a “global interrupt threshold value” is a threshold value that is applicable to all active threads.

In contrast, Hobbs discloses that “[a]n interrupt will not be recognized or serviced by the processor until the priority of the code thread is lower than the priority of the interrupt.” (See col. 2, lines 54-57.) Thus, Hobbs compares the priorities of two different processor functions (i.e., code thread and interrupt). This is different from determining whether a priority of an interrupt is higher than a global threshold value, as claimed. Therefore, independent claim 1, along with its dependent claims 2-5, 9-16, 20, and 21, is patentable.

Since independent claims 22, 25, and 29 include limitations similar to the limitation discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, they are patentable over the applied references for at least the same reasons. Dependent claims 2-5, 9-16, 20, 21, 26, 20-32, 34, and 35 depend either directly or indirectly from the independent claims, and are therefore patentable over the applied reference for at least the same reasons.

Radhakrishna was applied as allegedly teaching features recited in dependent claims 6-8, 17-19, 27, 28, 33, and 36. Radhakrishna fails to make up for the deficiencies of Hobbs. Thus, claims 6-8, 17-19, 27, 28, 33, and 36 are patentable by virtue of their dependence on independent claim 1.

In view of the above, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

In the event a fee is required or if any additional fee during the prosecution of this application is not paid, the Patent Office is authorized to charge the underpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-2215.

Dated: January 20, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By *Laura C. Brutman*

Laura C. Brutman

Registration No.: 38,395

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP

1177 Avenue of the Americas

New York, New York 10036-2714

(212) 277-6500

Attorney for Applicant